REMARKS

Elections/ Restrictions

Applicants affirm election without traverse of the Invention of Group I, Claims 1-32. Claims 33-57 are withdrawn without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner asserts that Claims 4 and 17 are indefinite because of the phrase "or the like." This phrase has been cancelled solely to remove the indefinite language and not in view of any cited prior art or to overcome any cited art.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 27, 31 and 32 were rejected as being anticipated by Hendricks, et al. Independent Claim 27 has been amended to more completely define applicant's invention and clearly distinguish this Claim 27 and 28-32 dependent thereon from the prior art.

Claim 27 and its dependent claims 28-32 have been amended to recite a "feed from each video camera and an encoder coupled to each feed providing both at least one high resolution video output and a low resolution video output."

Applicants' significant invention enables remote viewers of an event, such an athletic event, to have direct control over their view of the event. Unlike commercial television broadcasting, Applicants' invention enable each event viewer to simultaneously see the event from all of the installed video group of cameras and, enable the viewer to select any desired camera to supply a high resolution video output to a large screen and lower resolution video outputs the remaining views to smaller screens.

Neither the cited Hendricks nor any of the other cited references provides this novel system. Rather, the description in Hendricks, on page 34, third paragraph is of a system in which the video resolution is the same for all image sizes. Moreover, as described below with respect to the Hosaka patent, there is no teaching by Hosaka of an encoder coupled to each video feed.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-26 were rejected as being unpatentable over Hendricks in view of Hosaka, et al. (6,020,923).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims.

The claimed recitation of "a plurality of television content providers located at different venues throughout the world, each content provider having multiple video cameras already installed at a particular venue in use for commercial television broadcasting" (emphasis added) is very different than the system taught by Hendricks on page 45, under the heading "Broadcast Television and Cable Television." The cameras 104 of Hendricks are either all at a "single remote site" or "numerous remote sites, each with its own video camera (emphasis added). This, however, is not what is claimed by Applicants. Rather, see Claims 1-3 which recite television content providers located at different venues throughout the world, each content provider having multiple video cameras already installed at a particular venue...". This recited structure is very different than Hendricks. Applicants' invention enables dual usage of the already installed television cameras such that these cameras (a) continue to be used in a commercial television network in which, typically, the feed from only a single camera is available at any particular time on the commercial television network and (b) these same cameras are used to provide a "parallel" lead to the internet for "simultaneous viewing of all of the cameras in commercial use at a venue." The dramatic growth of the Web in the interim since Applicants originally filed for their invention in 1999 clearly affirms that the potential world-wide internet audience for viewing live action events by way of Applicants' invention is truly enormous. In order to further emphasize the significant distinction between Applicants' invention and the cited Hendricks reference, Claim 1 has been amended to further recite that "said parallel lead in no way compromises or degrades the installed broadcast signals" and recite that the system provides "for enabling each user to become their own programming director of said multiple video cameras and create an enhanced ability to view said events on their P.C. display including simultaneous viewing of all of the feeds from the cameras in commercial use at a venue." This claimed subject matter is nowhere taught or suggested by the cited art.

The Examiner, while recognizing that Hendricks fails to teach "an encoder coupled to each parallel lead, each encoder providing both at least one high resolution output and a low resolution output, both outputs being compatible with simultaneous delivery over internet delivery channels"(emphasis added), rejects the claims in view of Hosaka. Applicants respectfully traverse the §103 rejection in view of the Hosaka patent. Hosaka fails to teach or suggest any modification of Hendricks to achieve Applicants' claimed invention. Rather Hosaka

describes something quite different, namely a system for providing at the output of multiplexor 7 of Figure 1 a single bit stream formed from a low resolution image and a high resolution image (leads 1 and 4 shown in Figure 1). Applicants' recitation of an "encoder coupled to each parallel lead" is not met by Figure 1 or any other figure of Hosaka, et al. Hosaka's frame expander 35 is not an encoder. There is no teaching in Hosaka taken singly or in combination with Hendricks to teach using already installed video cameras to supply both high resolution and low resolution video outputs, "both outputs being compatible with simultaneous delivery over internet delivery channels," as recited in the claims.

Dependent Claims 28, 29 and 30 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hendricks in view of Carpenter (Claim 28) Dedrick (Claim 29) and Hendricks. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection in view of the amendments to independent Claim 27. As noted above, the cited prior art, taken singly or in combination, fails to teach or make obvious the invention defined in amended Claim 27. There is no suggestion in the additional Carpenter or Dedrick references that would make obvious the novel combinations recited in dependent Claims 28, 29 and 30.

In view of the foregoing comments, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is fully in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly solicited. If any questions remain, however, the Examiner is cordially invited to contact the undersigned attorney so that any such matters may be promptly resolved.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: April 12, 2006

By: _____

Louis J. Knobbe
Registration No. 18,780
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(949) 760-0404

2501707/dp